

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

COURT OF APPEAL, FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

CHARLOTTE MAY,

Defendant and Appellant.

D062973

(Super. Ct. No. SCN290287)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of San Diego County,
Adrienne A. Orfield, Judge. Affirmed.

Jared G. Coleman, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and
Appellant.

No appearance by Respondent.

In October 2011, Charlotte May pled guilty to possessing a firearm within 10
years of being convicted of violating Penal Code¹ section 422 (criminal threats)

¹ All further statutory references are to the Penal Code unless otherwise specified.

(§ 12021, subd. (c)(1)). On March 14, 2012, the court reduced the offense to a misdemeanor and sentenced May to probation.

On June 28, 2012, May admitted violating probation. The court reinstated probation on modified terms and conditions.

May filed a timely notice of appeal. May did not obtain a certificate of probable cause.

Counsel has filed a brief pursuant to *People v. Wende* 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*) and *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738 (*Anders*) raising possible but not arguable issues. We offered May the opportunity to file her own brief on appeal but she has not responded.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The facts of the underlying offense are not relevant to this appeal. The "facts" of this appeal relate to the terms of the grant of probation and the original probation order and the acts leading to violation of probation.

The March 2012 grant of probation required that May not violate any laws except minor traffic offenses. In June 2012, May pled guilty to driving on a suspended license (Veh. Code, § 14601.1, subd. (a)), a misdemeanor.

DISCUSSION

As we have previously noted, appellate counsel has filed a brief indicating he is unable to identify any arguments for reversal and asks this court to review the record for error as mandated by *Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436. Pursuant to *Anders, supra*, 386 U.S. 738, the brief identifies the possible, but not arguable issue:

1. Whether this appeal is proper without obtaining a certificate of probable cause?

We have reviewed the entire record in accordance with *Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436 and *Anders, supra*, 386 U.S. 738 and have not found any reasonably arguable appellate issues. Competent counsel has represented May on this appeal.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

HUFFMAN, J.

WE CONCUR:

BENKE, Acting P. J.

IRION, J.